App. F. IX-4

Previous References 1935-6 (Rev)
Rev 2496 - 31 - 1, 150 to 52
Rev 2023 - 34 - 1-6
Rev 10 - 28 - 1-7
Rev 620 - 34 - 1 to 2
Letter References.
Rev 134 - 28 - 1-2
Rev 164 - 30 - 1-2
Rev 174 - 34 - 1-2
Rev 174 - 30 - 1-9
Rev 74 - 31 - 1 to 2
Rev 141 - 35 - 5 to 6

Approved

Rev File No. 141-35
Serial Nos. 1 — 4

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 4

Part B for January 1936

SUBJECT.

Appeal of Mr M. Basettappa, Merchant
AK Peth, Bangalore City re: R.S.No.
127/2 of Kethamaranahalli
Bangalore Taluk

No 8449 dt 19 12-35

To Mr. M. Basettappa
c/o Mr. M. Narayana Rao
M.A.B.L.
Advocate Bangalore City

WD 03607—GPB—22,500—2-8-35

Under the Head

Cancelled
9/VII/36

Misc appl no 6 of 1935-36

[App. F. III-2

General and Revenue Secretariat

File No. of 1935-6

Petition of 25.7.1935 filed in Misc. No. [illegible] Advocate Bangalore city on behalf of his client Mr M. Basavappa Merchant residing at Attur, Salem Dist & city appealing against the order of the Revenue Commissioner in Misc appl 23/33-34 of 8/6/1935 dismissing the appeal before him re: S. No 12 a marginal add village Bangalore Taluk formerly endowed to College Boarding Bangalore city, & this institution has already been dft.

The petitioner in brief of the P.W.D says that he & his ancestors have been enjoying the Inam since 1849 as borne out by the lease deeds & receipts issued by the P.W.D & he has that he has done acts of improvement to the land & is entitled to special compensation. &c. &c. [illegible]

NOTE—Contn Sheet.

2)

May appl no 6 of 1935-36
re: the claim of the petr for two
lands in Kethamanahalli Bangalore Tq.

File No. of 1935-6 — General and Revenue Secretariat

If appld in the circumstances urged by the appellants, the appeal will be admitted & a case called for

Kind regn is invited to the orders passed in Mng file no 223-34 Sto 1-6 post ofs. The records will be called for if approved.

30/5/35

To Tue 31/5

Memo of financial form appointed P.A. to Govt for Kind Signature

3/9

Petition sent to M.C. vide no 331 dt 5-9-35.
Letter no RE 20/35-36 dt 2.10.35 from the Deputy Commissioner forwarding records relating to the appeal petition.

O.A.S. No 123 — Re. S. No 127/2 of Kethamanahalli Bangalore was formerly Devadaya Inam endowed for a dispensary known as Dodmilli - Araleppa Bangalore city. There is no information in the records since which year the above Inam has been defunct. The Rve in his letter dt 29

A&M 23/33-34 of 29.11.1934 addressed to the Pleader says that there is reason to believe that the Muttawalis to Court & the appellants in person in the case above have been in 1677 - (Vide the last portion of para 2 of this letter).

4) In para 3 of the same letter the previous Mr (the present Second Member of Council) has opined as follows :—

= The case would therefore seem to be one in which under the Second proviso to Sec^n 60 of the Religious & Charitable Reg^n — the land should be fully assessed & left in the hands of the alienee the assessment being made on the original Institution.

* * *

& finally he recommended that the land measure taken as soon as Authorities Mtte are he understood that the Sec^y was also an absentee & the Court of the Mr had to 'see' to the same previous Mr. ...

This office letter no 1141 Proc. A 23/1-5 additional information for was issued to ... land & the A.M.

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

File No. of 193 .

General and Revenue Secretariat

The respt. filed objn as in his letter No 2254/33 forwarding the report of the D.C. of Bijapur — from which it is seen that the petr has failed to take the land proceedings before Assistant — As a result of enquiries in report, instructions were issued in this office letter No Rev 30 of 25/1/35 that the appeal pending before him might be proceeded with as he was competent to do. His decision is in Misc Appln 123/33 dated 8/6/35 x 2
This application now for M.C. in appeal now for before Govt.

1) Regarding the land in question when the petr came up direct before Govt orders were passed

266 - 30 - 2 of 26/4/32 as follows:— (Flag M)

The petr represents that he is entitled to the land as he has had adverse possession for a long period — he has to prove such possession to support his right to the land — His request for the grant of the land cannot be complied with until he establishes his adverse enjoyment of it for the required period In pursuance of this he obtains to have field

Papers filed

Serial No.

filed an appeal before the S.D.O. who on 6.9.32 has held as follows:

× × × ×

It will be seen that the adverse possession now set up commenced from the year 1877. Hence the case comes under Cl (b) of para II of the Chief Commr's notification No 266 of 17.11.1877. The adverse possession set up therefore falls to the ground & the action in having to resume the land & have possession of by the Auditor is quite correct.

(2) Thereupon the petr appealed to the D.C. against the above said decision of the S.D.O. & the D.C. Bangalore has decided as follows:-

× × × × × × × ×

The appellant's possession of the property can not be held as being adverse because adverse possession as against Govt cannot be claimed unless from the time that Govt come to know of such possession. The law in question is a beneficial one

NOTE.—Contn. Sheet.

WD 03591—GPB—30,000—18-7 35

[illegible] Paine re Mecca Notice that it was not necessary for Colonial Secretary to give notice by three insertions to require the attendance of the Petitioner before Court. He is opposed to the Petitioner's claim, as he is quite satisfied that [illegible]

Against this order there was an appeal, before the Master; the latter officer has given his decision as follows:—

"The Case would seem to be one in which the lands should be freely assessed & left in the hands of the Alience, the assessment being made on the original institution. But as the beneficiary institution is dependent & so it is the proper to confer a personal right of alienation on the appellant, I suggest that a different course might be adopted." He finds he recommends to the Grand Officers of the Archipelago, thereby recognising the long standing arrangement which he thinks it would not be fair to disturb at this distance of time by reversing

Serial No.

the lands from becoming the personal property of the appellant — La — when he was asked to dispose of the appeal which he had already heard, he has in his minute the appeal he'd — "

× × × ×

According to the entries in the Civil Register the original title (Arbella — was not only in existence but was in good order at the time of the Inam Settlement 1874-75 — 1880 (?) This document at the case the possession of the Inamdar could not be adversely to the — It is not therefore a case of — sion to 31st Jan 1853. × × × ××

At the same time the appellant is not entitled to the benefit of the proviso (2) of Sec^n 10 of the R & C. 9. Reg^n which applies to other than Mulls. Under Sec^n 30 of the Reg^n the lands are to be resumed & the original being deficient thereby the Govt lists under Sec^n the Govt

The records end

NOTE.—Contn. Sheet.

WD 03591—GPB—30,000—18-7-35

be the law for having fed the Gam dars with
[illegible] - In this
Case it is respectfully submitted that
if the ~~Cultivator~~ Collector/ Asst has in Collusion
with any of the Asst had a Document,
he could have brought the yield from
Kethamanahalli land having
been enjoyed by a person unconnected
with the Asst to the notice of Govt.
the Govt. regrets do
not know of any such complaints
has been received - either from the
Mahadhipathi or the citizens of
Arale peth Dodmane.

15) As for cases in which Devadaya
Inam lands have been given to the Archakadars
on full assessment, Kindly refer
is in order to Mrs Collections 164-34-2 ×4
Mrs 134-28-2, Mrs 66-34-2, [illegible]
Mrs 304-34-4 & Mrs 10-28-7 ×(Shall give in 15 days)

16) In Mrs 304-34 one Ramaswamy Archak
[illegible] as he was in possession of the Inam
land & had the crops thereon for more
than 12 years prior to the passing of
the Regn VII of 1927, has been given the land
on payment of full assessment.

Re:- Claim for Kethamanakalee land formerly endowed by ~~the~~ [illegible]

Serial No.

J

In another case leading W/S No 15-28-30 Mug/134 28 2 & 2 2-7, the A.C has opined that the occupant has undisputed possession of the land for over 12 years prior to the passing of the Mad. Hqr 1927 & accordingly the in Cause has Cancelled the land from the Assessment of Inst. Assessment, which Called is now going for the benefit of the Inst.n for which the land was originally endowed.

17) In the particular Circumstances the beneficiary Inst.n is deprived, the Assessment if ordered, will be credited to Govt Revenue. Hence.

18) Ribd for Xerox of the Case may be kept. bearing — G.O 6/12/88

19) Paras 8 to 13 of the above note explains the case. The cases referred to in paras 15 & 16 cannot be applied to all forms like the present case. The main point for consideration is as follows

NOTE.—Contn. Sheet.

WD 03091—GPB—30,000—13-7-35

16) Mez appl no 60 of 1935-36 re: In the matter of Pandia Nekkanalanchalli formerly [illegible] Taluk

Mez File No. of 193 . General and Revenue Secretariat

In April 1932 the First Member ordered that the request of the petr (appellant in the present case) "for the grant of the land cannot be complied with until he establishes his adverse enjoyment of it for the required period". In regard to this point the S.D.O. after careful enquiry has in the course of his order dt 10.8.32 observed as follows:- P 7

"Hence the case comes under Cl B of Part II of the Chief Commrs notification no 266 dt 17.11.77 (Hly P) the adverse possession set up herein fails to the ground and the action taken in having resumed the land & taken possession of by the Amildar is quite correct." (Paper Hly) L

20) The D.C. in upholding the decision of the S.D.O. has remarked as follows:— K

"Further the appellants' possession of the property cannot be held as being adverse to Govt because adverse possession as against Govt can be counted only from the time that Govt come to know of such possession" (Paper Hly K)

21) The D.C. also has dismissed the appeal for reasons set forth in his order dt 25.5.35. (Hly D). J

22) In view of the above it is for orders

464 Muz appl no 6 of 1938-86

Serial No.

GENERAL SECRETARY'S 9 DEC. 1935 313

whether the case may be posted for hearing or whether the appeal may be dismissed in view of the finding recorded by the first Court which the appellants in support of his contention.

9/12/35

Gen: Secy)

10/12

9/10/12

1 0 DEC. 1935/ 41.26

First Member)

24) In view of the concurrent finding that there has been no adverse possession, I don't think it necessary to post the case. It has been fully explained in the Courts below & I do not see any reason to modify the order passed. The appeal may be dismissed

13/12

2/13/12

GS 14/12

16/12

2/16/12

WD 03591—GPB—30,000—18-7-35

NOTE.—Contn. Sheet.

529

Misc File No. 141 of 1935

General and Revenue Secretariat

No 844 of 19.12.35 to Mr. M. Basavaraja
C/o Mr. M. Nanjundarao Advocate Bangalore
City intimating that his appeal is dismissed.

B 2/1/36



Due Bill No 112
of 35-36

GENERAL RECORD
25 JULY 1935

141-35

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA

OF MYSORE.

---:ooOoo:---

Muz 141-35

Muz appl no 6 of 1935-36.

M. Basettappa, Merchant, Residing at Akkipet, Bangalore City. (Petitioner in the court below). ... Appellant.

Under section 30 of The Religious and Charitable endowments' Regulation, appellant begs and prefers this appeal to this Hon'ble court from the order of the Learned Muzrai-Commissioner in Mysore dated 8th June 1935 and communicated to the appellant about the close of June. Appellant applied for a copy and was informed that the same was ready on 9th July 1935, the same was obtained and this appeal has been preferred.

1. The facts of the case are set-out in the pre-amble annexed to the order under appeal. The appeal relates to survey number 123/ of Khethamaranahally, Bangalore Taluk. It was observed in Muzari appeal No.12/30-31 on the file of Government that the said land was in unauthorised occupation of the appellant and his predecessors in title and that the same being an INAM granted to the DODDA MUTT OF ARALEPET is registered in the INAM SETTLEMENT as such, and the said MUTT having become defunct, it had to be disposed of under -

under-

GOVERNMENT ORDER No.1769-72. Muz 49-28-2 dated 1-3-1929.

2. Thereafter appellant obtained an order from Government in Miscellaneous Memo no.1556. Muz.246--31-2 that his claim for the same on the ground of adverse enjoyment may be inquired into and laid his case thereafter the Sub division officer of Bangalore in his petition dated 24-6-1932 and the present appeal arised therefrom.

The grounds of appeal are as follows:-

1. All the courts below have omitted from considering the circumstance that appellant and his predecessors in interest including Chennaveeradevaru, the transferee of this land in 1849 enjoyed it on their own accout and that this was borne out by the lease deeds and receipts available in the case.

2. The courts below should have noticed that the circumstance that in 1874-75 the affirs of the Dodda Mutt of Aralepet wherein "Good order" strengthened the case for adverse possession urged by the appellant rather than dilute it.

3. The courts below should have discussed the question of adverse possession as a question of fact and should have set out their conclusions after an appreciation of evidence in the case. They have erred in not exercising their jurisdiction and in shelving thes question. This is an error of law.

4. On the evidence in the case it is indubitably clear that appellant has made out adverse and exclusive possession.

5. The courts below ought to have held that in view of appellant and his predecessors in interest

and continued enjoyment acts of improvement done by them and the like appellant was entitled to special equities and that in analogous circumstance government have been pleased in many instances such as Muzrai - case No.20/1928 to make similar grants to persons in possession, even though their - enjoyment fell short of attracting the benefits of the Chief commissioner's notification abovesaid or proviso 2 to section 10 of the Religious and charitable endowments' Regulation of Mysore).

6. Courts below should have held that the terms of the Chief commissioner's notification dated 17-11-1877 applied to this case and that at any rate in the alternative proviso.2 to section 10 of Religious and Charitable endowments Regulation was applicable.

7. The order under appeal is inadequate to the facts and erroneous and has to be setaside.

Bangalore City
25th July 1935.

The following are produced with this.

1. Order dated 18th June 1935.
2. Post card " 8th July 1935.

A-80 77

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMR. Mg. H.C. 20/35 5 SEP 1935

M^r C V N

Advocate for appellant.

No 331/Muz 9-5-9-35

Forwarded with Compliments to the Muzrai Commissioner for favour of Return of the entire records connected with The Case.

By order

for General Secretary

HC 20
35-36

Memo

Forwarded with compliments to the Deputy Commissioner Bangalore District for favour of submitting the entire records connected with the case



Revenue
for Huzur Commissioner
12.9.35

Immediate
C3 1052/35-36

Revenue

Forwarded to the Assistant, Bangalore for submission of the connected records thro' the S.D.O.

The records should reach this office before 20.9.35

for Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore dist

Revenue C 133
35-36

Submitted to the Subdivision Officer Bangalore subdivision.

Revenue 133
35-36

The connected file of records is enclosed herewith for kind information. Some of the documents as noted in the list enclosed have been ~~exhibited~~ marked as exhibits in the court of the Munsiff Bangalore city, who has been addressed to return them. On receipt of them they will be submitted.

Amildar
20.9.35

23.9.35

Revenue C 1602

Bangalore
20-9-35 Amildar

COURT FEE

Office of the Hus: Comm^r
Galle. Bangalore July 35

Dear Sir,

I write to inform you that the copy applied for by you is ready for delivery. (Hus: Appl No: 23/33-34)
Please receive the same during office hours (11 AM to 5 PM) on any working day.

Yours Sincerely
D'Souza
Manager
Hus. Comm'r Office

ON MYSORE GOVT. SER

[T]he name and address of the
[o]fficial designation of the

addres
sende

To

M. Narayanarao
Advocate
Balepet

Bangalore C

S Jayasamarao
Mus. Com's Office

COURT FEE

ಮುದ್ರೆ EIGHT ANNAS ೮ಆ-೦

ಮುದ್ರೆ EIGHT ANNAS ೮ಆ-೦

In the court of the Mysore Commissioner
in Mysore Bangalore
Appeal No. 23/33-34.

Appellant :-
Basettappa, Merchant,
residing at Akkipet
Bangalore city

Vs

Respondent
Government

Subject

Appeal against the order of the Deputy Commissioner Bangalore District directing the resumption of S No. 127/2 of Kethamaranahalli, Bangalore Taluk originally endowed to the Dod Mutt at Arlepet, Bangalore city, from the possession of the appellant and rejecting the plea of adverse possession set up by the latter.

Facts of the case

Government in their order No. Mys Appeal 12/30-31 dated 9-6-1931 set aside the findings of this office and directed that the above S No should be resumed from the unauthorised possession of the Akkipet Mutt, Bangalore city and dealt with under G.O. No. 1769-70-/Mys 69-28 2 dated 1st March 1929, relating to the inams of defunct Institutions, as the Arlepet Dod Mutt to which the land was originally endowed had become defunct. On 8-4-1932, the appellant who was the Vahivatdar of Akkipet Dod Mutt petitioned Government, stating that the S.No in question was gifted by the original grantee (Thotadappa) to Channaveeradevaru of Akkipet Dod Mutt in 1849, that since then the latter and his successors (including the appellant) have been enjoying the land adversely to the purpose of the grant and that the land should be confirmed to him on full assessment. Government in this case No 18 of 1931-32 passed

22nd April 1932 held that the plea of adverse possession was a question of fact which the appellant should establish before the lower courts The appellant then approached the Sub Division officer and gave a statement on 8 8 1932 to the effect that the land was a Brahmadaya inam granted by the late Highness Krishnaraya Wodeyar to Mathada Thotadappa in 1822, that the same was gifted by the orginal grantee to Channaveera-devaru of Akkihebbal Mutt in 1849 with the request that the latter should manage the affairs of Attalebbal Doddi Mutt which was in decay and that Channaveeradevaru in turn bequeathed all the properties and the right to manage the Mutt by a will dated 19-12-1877 to his (appellant's) brother ~~Thotadappa~~ The Sub Division officer passed orders to the effect that the plea of adverse possession set up by him is not sustainable in view of the fact that Chennabeeradevaru (appellant's predecessor) held the land for the maintenance of Attalebbal Mutt of Thotadappa and that the will relied on by the appellant transferred the entire management of the Mutt and its properties to the successor The Sub Division officer opined that the case should be treated under clause B of para II of Chief Commissioner's Notification No 266 dated 17th November 1877 and held that the land should be resumed from the possession of the appellant On appeal preferred to the Deputy Commissioner, the latter held that the alienation of Devadaya land granted for the benefit of a particular Mutt was invalid, that the terms of the Inam settlement were conclusive and that the appellant cannot be deemed to be in adverse possession of the land as against Govern-ment without notice Hence the present appeal The case came up for hearing on 31-10-1934 when the counsel for the appellant Mr M. Narayana Rao was present.

Order No App 23/33-34 25th May 1935

Even if the deed of gift said to have been executed in 1849 be conceded to be genuine (although there is room for doubt on the point, it only

ould ... ts to a transfe of the control y
of the Arlehet Dod Mutt (to a new manager)
The transferee (Channaveerade varu) admitted
during the Inam settlement inquiry that he held
the land for the maintenance of that institution.
He claimed no independent title either for
himself or on behalf of the Akkihet Mutt, to which
the appellant belongs According to the entries
in the Quit Rent Register, the original Mutt
(Arlehet Dod Mutt was not only in existence
but was "in good order" at the time of the
inam settlement (1874-75) and so long as
this remained the case, the possession of the
manager could not be adverse to the
institution. This is not therefore a case of
alienation prior to 31st January 1853 and
the provisions of the Chief Commissioners Notification
No. 266
dated 17th November 1877 could not be extended
to it At the same time, the appellant is not
entitled to the benefit of the proviso (2) to section 10
of the Religious and Charitable Institutions
Regulation which applies to institutions other
than Mutts. Under section 30 of the Regulation,
the lands are liable to be resumed and the
original institution being defunct, they
have to be dealt with under the Government
order of 1st March 1929

The appeal is therefore dismissed

sd / Madhava Rau
Muzrai Commissioner

Copy applied for by Mr. M. Narayanadas
" ready on 3.7.35
" delivered on 22.7.35
No. of words 720
Copying fees 1-00
Comparing - 0-3-8
Total 1-3-8
Copied by
Compared by S. Jagannadas

Manager
Muzrai Commissioner



Before the Government of Mysore at Bangalore.

In the Court of

No. OF 1935 –1936.

Basettappa. } Vs. }

I the appellant above named, do hereby nominate and appoint **Mr. M. NARAYANA RAO, M.A., B.L., Advocate,** in the above suit and do hereby empower the said **Advocate** to appear for and on my behalf in the above suit, to take all steps which may be necessary on my behalf arising out of or in connection with the above suit either during progress or after its decision, to sign and subscribe his name to any document which he may deem proper, to execute any decree that may be passed in my favour and to receive out of the Court any refund of money which may be lodged or become payable or receivable on my behalf and on receipt thereof to grant receipt or other sufficient discharges for the same, to withdraw, compromise or refer to arbitration the said suit, to appoint one or more substitutes and to act and perform all other matters and things relating thereto or connected therewith, to represent me in matters relating to the same and to act as fully and effectually to all intents and purposes as I might do if personally present and did the same. And I do hereby agree to pay all fees, costs, charges and expenses which may be incurred and to allow, ratify and confirm whatsoever the said **Advocate** shall lawfuly do or cause or procure to be done by the virtue of these presents.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand this 25th day of July 1935.

ACCEPTED.

Advocate for Appellant.

Signed before me by the executant who is known to me

14 8-30 The Bangalore Press

M.C 13.] No. MC 20/35-36
Encl. 1 & Six files

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER,
IN MYSORE,

Dated, Bangalore, 22nd October 193 5.

MUZRAI BRANCH * GENL. & REV. SECRETARIAT * 464 25 OCT 1935

FROM K. V. Anantaraman, Esq., B.A.,
~~N. MADHAVA RAO, Esq., B.A., B.L.,~~
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

Rev 141-35-3.

BANGALORE 24 OCT 1935

To

M. Venkatesa Iyengar, Esq., I.A.S.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
.....General.....*Department.*

25/10/35

SIR,

Appeal of Mr. M. Basettappa, Merchant, Akkipet, Bangalore City, appealing against this office order in re: old S.No.123 of or Re-S.no.127/2 of Lethamaranahalli, Bangalore Taluk.

Adverting to your Memo No.331/Muz. dated 5-9-1935 calling for the entire records re: the above, I have the honor to forward herewith the file of vernacular records received with the Bangalore District Deputy Commissioner's letter No.C3-1052/35-36 dated 1st October 1935 as also this office files as noted in the margin.*

The appeal petition is returned herewith.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

K V Anantaraman

Muzrai Commissioner.

*Appeal No.23/33-34
D2 Dis.183/31-32
Appeal No.33/27-28
D1 Dis.181/34-35
D2 Dis.755/31-32

I C 13.] No. MC. 20/35-3. Rec'd on/-

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER,
IN MYSORE,

Dated, Bangalore, 8th November 1935.

FROM K. V. Anantaraman, Esq., B.A.,
~~N. MADHAVA RAO, Esq., B.A., B.L.,~~
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

To

M. Venkatesa Iyengar, Esq., B.A.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
General *Department,*

9 NOV. 1935

SIR,

Appeal of Mr. M. Basetappa, Merchant, Akkipet, Bangalore City, appealing against this office order in re: old S.No.127/2 of Kethamarnahalli, Bangalore City.

—

In continuation of this office letter No.M.C.20/35-36 dated the 24th October 1935, forwarding the records re: the above, I have the honor to forward herewith a few more papers since received with the Bangalore District Deputy Commissioner's letter No.33-1052/35-36 dated the 2nd November 1935.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Muzrai Commissioner.

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

General and Revenue Secretariat

Bangalore, Dated 18th Decr. 1935.

No 8444/Mag 141-38-4

Official Memorandum.

To

Mr.M.Basettappa,
c/o Mr.M.Narayana Rao, M.A., B.L.,
Advocate, Bangalore City.

******

With reference to his petition dated 25th July 1935 appealing against the orders of the Muzrai Commissioner in respect of re-survey No.127/2 of Kethamaranahalli, Bangalore Taluk, formerly endowed to the Dodda Mutt at Aralepet, Bangalore City, Mr.Basettappa, Merchant, residing at Akkipet, Bangalore City, is informed that Government see no reason to modify theorders passed by the lower courts in the matter, and that his appeal is therefore dismissed.

By order,

Sd. M.Venkatesa Iyengar.

General Secretary to Governmen

P.T.O.

B.K.M.

Memo No. 845 Pres
Encl Records
Dated Bangalore, the 18th Decr. 1935.

Copy of the above is forwarded with compliments to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore returning records received with his letters Nos. H.C. 20/35-36 dated 24th October 1935 and 9th November 1935.

By order,

General Secretary to Government

UBJECT

Section Muz

File No. 141-35

Serial No. 4

No. 844

To

Mr Baseshappa c/o Mr M—
Narayana Rao M. A. B-L
Advocate Bangalore city

Diary No. of letter replied to ...2 4/...

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 193 .

Date of issue 19-12-1935

Signed by M V B Venkatakrishnayya

With ref to his petn dt 25/7/35 appealing against the order of the Muz. Com— re Survey No 127/2 Hanumanahalli, Bangalore Tq, formerly endorsed to the Woddarpalya at Avalahalli, Bangalore city, Mr Baseshappa, merchant, residing at Akkipet, Bangalore city, is informed that the Case has been fully enquired

directing the resumption of

SKA

List of enclosures .....

Copied by .....

Examined by.....

WD 01956—GPB—23,500—12-6-34

~~In the Courts below, there~~

Gone see no reason to modify
the order passed by the Govt Contrib.
C. in the matter.
& that his appeal is therefore dismissed.

~~Dejected~~

B-O

2/16/12

~~Forgunsee~~

~~Ex~~ memo no 845 Jms dated 19-12-35
Copy to M.C. rehuring records Encl Records
received with his letter no
H.C. 20/35-36 dy 24.10.35 &
9.11.35.

B. O

2/16/12

~~Forgunsee~~.

2 16/12/35